

Remarks

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-33, 35-41, 43-67, 69-78, and 80-96 are in the application. Claims 1, 33, 63, 65, 66, and 78 are in independent form. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-33, 35-41, 43-67, 69-78, and 80-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Yamamoto et al. [US 6,553,431; hereinafter Yamamoto] in view of Lo et al. [US 5,911,044; hereinafter Lo]. Applicants respond as follows.

Independent claims 1, 33, 63, 65, 66, and 78 have been amended to recite a wireless mobile information apparatus and that the communication channel includes a radio frequency wireless communication channel at the wireless mobile information apparatus. Recitation of a wireless mobile information apparatus clarifies that the recited information apparatus operates in a portable or mobile manner without a wired connection to the recited output devices.

This clarification is made in response to the Examiner's interpretation of mobile as being merely capable of movement, based on the generalized definition from The American Heritage College Dictionary. Applicants submit that the Examiner's interpretation of the word "mobile" is not supported in the technical field of the present invention. By the Examiner's interpretation, a mainframe computer would be a "mobile device," which applicants submit is contrary to common usage in the art. Nonetheless applicants amend the claims to explicitly state an additional clarifying distinction.

Lo describes a system and method for performing scanning operations using a scanner connected to a server computer and transmitting acquired images from the scanner server to a client computer. As illustrated in Fig. 2, a client computer 102, a scanner server computer 130, and file server computer are connected to a computer network 120. A scanner 144 is connected to the scanner server computer 130 "via a bus or cable 140." (Lo, col. 5, lines 47-55.) Lo further states that the computer network 120 may use a wireless network as a

general description of a networked computer environment. (Lo, col. 6, lines 24-26.) Lo provides no teaching or suggestion that such a wireless network would have any applicability to the communication between the scanner and the server computer. Rather, Lo would lead one skilled in the art away from using a wireless connection between the scanner and the server computer by specifying that the connection is "via a bus or cable 140." (Lo, col. 5, lines 47-55.)

Yamamoto is directed to a multifunction device, such as one having a scanner that is connected to multiple output devices (e.g., printer, fax machine). As noted by the Examiner, Yamada fails to teach a method in which the communication channel includes a wireless communication channel. (Office action, page 3)

Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 33, 63, 65, 66, and 78, and their dependent claims, are patentably distinct from the cited references. Neither Lo nor Yamamoto teaches or suggests a data output method that employs a radio frequency wireless communication channel between a wireless mobile information apparatus and one or more output devices. Both references are directed to a scanner in a fixed, wired connection to a computer network or system. Both references employ a wired connection between the scanner and the computer network or system. As a result, the wired scanners of Lo and Yamamoto function as immobile input devices that are distinct from the wireless mobile information apparatuses recited in the claims. Applicants request, therefore, that the rejections for anticipation by Lo and Yamamoto be withdrawn.

Moreover, applicants submit that the references fail to even suggest the claimed subject matter. The wired systems of Lo and Yamamoto are narrowly directed to scanner-type input devices, which are distinct in functionality from the pervasive mobile information apparatuses of the present invention.

In the rejection of claims 1 and 63, the Examiner fails to cite any teaching in the references for the step of "receiving at the wireless mobile information apparatus over the communication channel one or more attributes corresponding to the one or more output devices." Applicants note that the cited references

much teach or suggest each and every feature recited in a claim. Absence of any indication in the cited art of this feature renders the rejections of claim 1 and 63 and their dependent claims improper. Accordingly, applicants request that claims 1 and 63 and their dependent claims be allowed.

In the rejection of claims 33 and 65, the Examiner fails to cite any teaching in the references for the step of "receiving at the wireless mobile information apparatus one or more components associated with the selected output device and enabling the data content to be rendered by the selected output device, the one or more components including an indication of an output data associated with the selected output device" or the step of "conforming at the wireless mobile information apparatus the data content to the output data associated with the selected output device." Applicants note that the cited references much teach or suggest each and every feature recited in a claim. Absence of any indication in the cited art of this feature renders the rejection of claims 33 and 65 and their dependent claims improper. Accordingly, applicants request that claims 33 and 65 and their dependent claims be allowed.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request the same.

IPSOLOL LLP
111 SW COLUMBIA #7140
PORTLAND, OREGON 97201
TEL. (503) 249-7066
FAX (503) 249-7068

Respectfully Submitted,



Mark M. Meininger
Registration No. 32,428